

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1-35 are amended to at least correct minor grammatical errors and to conform the claims according to commonly accepted US patent practice.

#### **Rejections Under 35 USC §102**

The rejection of claims 1, 14, 27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yu et al. (US 6,684,087) is respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 is amended to more clearly recite “wherein a scroll action operates to change a position of the partial picture within the high resolution picture.” The Examiner asserts that Yu, at column 8 line 51 – column 9, line 10, and Fig. 7, discloses this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yu, at column 7, lines 23-53, relates to a method of compressing and transforming a picture file of high resolution into another picture file format capable of being displayed on a lower resolution screen, e.g., a mobile device. The lower resolution version of the picture file appears to be divided into smaller subsections that can be zoomed in on by pressing a corresponding key to provide a more detailed image of the subsection.

At column 8 line 51 – column 9, line 10, Applicants respectfully submit that Yu appears to only describe how the screen is divided into 3 rows of 3 subsections for 9 total subsections, and the user can select a subsection to view in further detail by pressing a corresponding key on the mobile device keypad, the keys comprising the numbers 1 thru 9 to represent the 9 subsections of the screen. Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere does Yu disclose a method of scrolling between the individual subsections, once a particular subsection has been zoomed in on.

Accordingly, Yu fails to anticipate or suggest wherein “a scroll action operates to change a position of the partial picture within the high resolution picture,” as recited in amended claim 1.

A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102 requires every element of the claim to be included in the reference, either directly or inherently. Accordingly, because Yu does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 1, Applicants recited mobile communication terminal is distinguished over Yu and therefore the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is improper. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that independent claim 1 is patentable over Yu.

Amended claim 14 is a method claim based upon the apparatus of claim 1. Accordingly, based upon the argument presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is likewise patentable over Yu.

Regarding the rejection of claim 27 over Yu, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action is silent regarding where Yu discloses or suggests the recited “converted file database” configured to store picture file formatted data, and the “storing unit” configured to: generate indexes for each of the divided unit blocks; generate a file converted into picture file formatted data that includes the picture data and indexes of each unit block; and store the picture file formatted data in the converted file database. Applicants submit that Yu fails to disclose, teach or suggest these features.

Applicants further submit that Yu appears to only disclose a link server with an image database for storing image data according to an original version of the image. Furthermore, unlike the recited database that includes indexes of the divided unit blocks, Yu’s link server appears to only suggest a database for storing information related to a specific mobile device, the information including screen size and resolution and identification data. Once the link server has the information about the requesting mobile device, the link server will then convert the original image into a format that can be received by the mobile device and then transmit the converted image to the requesting mobile device. Furthermore, Yu’s converted images are not stored in a database within the link server, but are generated only after a specific mobile device submits a request. (See Yu, Figs. 6A, 6B, and column 8, lines 32-51, and column 9, line 10-16).

Based upon the argument presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Yu fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 27. Accordingly, the anticipation rejection of claim 27 over Yu is improper, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 32, as amended, recites “storing the converted files including the index information and unit blocks of picture data in a converted file database.” This feature is based upon an element claimed in the system of claim 27 and is supported in at least Fig. 9, and at page 15, lines 15-21 of the specification. Applicants submit that claim 32 is patentable over Yu at least based upon the arguments presented above with respect to claim 27. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 32 is respectfully requested.

**35 USC §103(a)**

Claims 2-13, 15-26, 28-31, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu in view of one or more of Lim (US 7,233,807), and Sano et al. (US 2002/0196970). As presented above, amended independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 32 are patentable over Yu. Applicants further submit that neither Lim nor Sano remedies the deficiencies of Yu with regard to independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 32. Accordingly, claims 2-13, 15-26, 28-31, and 33-35 are likewise patentable over all allowable combinations of the applied references, at least based on their dependency on independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 32, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the 35 USC§103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

All objections and rejections have been addressed. It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/  
Yoon S. Ham  
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429  
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
Date: February 3, 2009  
YSH/ERM